

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 JUAN R. ALBINO,

1:09-cv-02053 SMS (HC)

12 Petitioner,

ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

13 vs.

14 KEN CLARK, Warden,

15  
16 Respondent.  
17 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
18

19 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a habeas corpus action pursuant to 28  
20 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

21 The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity  
22 jurisdiction, be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants reside  
23 in the same state, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise  
24 to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is situated, or  
25 (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in which the action may  
26 otherwise be brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

27 In this case, the petitioner is challenging a conviction from Los Angeles County, which is in the  
28 Central District of California. Therefore, the petition should have been filed in the United States District

1 Court for the Central District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a case  
2 filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d  
3 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States  
5 District Court for the Central District of California.

6  
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 **Dated: December 2, 2009**

**/s/ Sandra M. Snyder**  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**